



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,909	08/04/2003	Ying-Ta Lu	LU21	2880

7590 04/03/2006

Troxell Law Office PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike Suite 1404
Falls Church, VA 22041

EXAMINER

SAID, MANSOUR M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/632,909

Applicant(s)

LU, YING-TA

Examiner

MANSOUR M. SAID

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duquette (6,667,877) in view of Agata et al. (6,947,278 B2; hereinafter referred to as Agata).

As to claim 1, Duquette teaches dual-screen notebook computer (figures 1 & 3-4) comprising: a notebook computer (laptop computer, (figures 1-4, (10)) and column 5, lines 10-15), the notebook computer having an LCD display module (laptop computer, (figures 1-4)); a pivot structure (figures 1 & 4, (50 & 80)) provided at one side of said notebook computer (column 5, lines 15-25, and column 5, lines 39-45); and a supplementary display module (second monitor screen, (figures 1 & 4, (70)) fastened pivotally with the pivot structure and electrically connected to an internal control circuit of said notebook computer for output of current status information of said notebook computer (figures 1-4, column 15-67 and column 6, lines 23-51).

Duquette does not expressly disclose a digital video camera installed in said notebook computer.

However, Agata teaches a digital video camera (camera, figures 1-6, 9-10, & 19-20, (40)) installed in said notebook computer (figures 1-24, column 9, lines 35-65, column 12, lines 24-59, column 20, line 38 through column 21, line 67 and column 22, lines 4-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Agata's LCD device having a video camera into Duquette's an LCD dual display device, so that the information processing apparatus can be used in augmented convenience of use when it used as a video camera, further more, the camera section having a large size, high picture quality and high performances (column 2, lines 15-59).

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duquette in view of Agata as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Batio (5,949,643).

Duquette and Agata teach all claimed limitations in claim 2 except that a game boy control button module.

However, Batio teaches a game boy control button module (game pad, (figures 1 &12, (11)) installed in the notebook computer (column 2, lines column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 5, column 5, lines 42-55, column 7, lines 24-37, column 8, lines 45-56 and column 9, lines 24-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Batio's laptop computer having a game control into Duquette's modified display device so as to use for playing a video games (column 2, lines 30-34).

Art Unit: 2629

4. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duquette in view of Agata as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shiraiwa (2003/0218860 A1).

As to claim 4, Duquette and Agata teach all claimed limitations, but they omit, such as wherein a screen of the supplementary display module is visible when notebook computer is closed.

However, Shiraiwa teaches wherein a screen of the supplementary display module (figure 6, (33a)) is visible when notebook computer is closed (as clearly shows in figure 6, the second display 33a, can function when the laptop computer is closed) (figures 4-7, column 2, paragraph 0034, and column 3, paragraph 0040).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Shiraiwa's teaching into Duquette's modified display device so as that the second display may function as a lid of the computer, when it closed (column 3, paragraph 0040).

As to claims 5-6, Duquette and Agata teach all claimed limitations except that a screen of LCD display module is not visible when the notebook computer is closed.

However, Shiraiwa teaches a screen of LCD display module is not visible when the notebook computer is closed. (Figure 4 and column 2, paragraph 0034).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Shiraiwa's teaching into Duquette's modified display device so as that the second display may function as a lid of the computer, when it closed (column 3, paragraph 0040).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2 and 4-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Suso et al. (6,069,648) teach an information communication terminal device.

Ho (6,778,383 B2) discloses an add-on display module for portable computer.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS OFFICE ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2629


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MANSOUR M. SAID whose telephone number is (703) 306-5411. The examiner can normally be reached on MF (8:30-6:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BIPIN SHALWALA can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mansour M. Said

3/24/06


Ricardo Osorio
PRIMARY EXAMINER